

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 31, 2005, claims 1-10 and 12-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112; claims 7, 9, 17-18, 23 and 26 contain allowable subject matter; claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 19-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,008; Hereinafter "Brown"); and claims 2-4, 12-16 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Schultheis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,050,176; hereinafter "Schultheis"). The foregoing rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 8, 10-13, 17, 23 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-26 are pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 112 rejections of claims 1-10 and 12-26:

At page 2 of the Action, the Examiner asserts that "values of current output from the heating units" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear how such heating units can output current. The Applicants respectfully submit that the heating units of the present invention include "a heating element and electrodes connected to the heating element" as recited in claim 1, for example. Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 have been amended for clarification purposes. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite "values of current in the heating units". Support for the amendments to claims 1, 7, 8 and 10 can be found at paragraphs [0026] and [0030] of the specification.

Further, claims 12 and 13 have been amended to be dependent upon claim 11.

Regarding allowable subject matter of claims 7, 9, 17-18, 23 and 26:

Claims 7, 17, 23 and 26 have been rewritten into independent form to be in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 18 should be in condition for allowance at least based upon their dependency upon claims 7 and 17, respectively.

Regarding the 102 rejections of claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 19-22 and 24:

Brown discusses a power distribution system for a range having a plurality of electric power consuming devices. The range includes first and second ovens, and a plurality of surface heating elements (see FIG. 1 and column 2, lines 36-46). The plurality of surface elements discussed in Brown are fixed, and therefore produce the same disadvantages of the conventional cooking apparatus described in paragraph [0005] of the specification. That is, the surface elements of Brown are not movable and the cooking container must be placed at a pre-

designated location on the range corresponding to one of the surface heating elements.

Brown fails to recite an electric cooking apparatus comprising "a control unit to operate a predetermined number of the heating units, which are determined according to the values of current detected from the current detecting unit, after operating the heating units," as recited in claim 1, for example. That is, in the present invention, all of the heating units are operated, and upon determining values of current detected, a predetermined number of the heating units, which correspond to the location and size of a cooking container placed thereon remain in operation. Therefore, in the present invention, the user is not limited to placing the cooking container on a fixed surface element.

Thus, Brown teaches away from the limitations of the present invention.

Regarding the 103 rejections of claims 2-4, 12-16 and 25:

At page 3 of the Action, the Examiner asserts that Schultheis makes up for the deficiencies of Brown.

Although, Schultheis discloses ceramic heating elements (see column 4, line 51), Schultheis fails to discuss the deficiencies of Brown, as mentioned above.

That is, similar to Brown, Schultheis discusses an arrangement of electrical heating elements as cooking zones, whereby each heating element is fixed (see FIGS. 1 and 2).

Neither Brown nor Schultheis, individually or combined, recite a cooking apparatus comprising "a control unit to operate a predetermined number of the heating units, which are determined according to the values of current detected from the current detecting unit, after operating the heating units," as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12-16, 19-22 and 24-25 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. For example, claim 14 recites "the heating units are printed under a total area of the cooking plate".

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Serial No. 10/787,136

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 26, 2008

By: Deidre M. Davis
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501